DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 460 CS 214 537

AUTHOR Olson, Lyle D.; And Others
TITLE State High School Press Freedom Laws: A Profile of Legislative Sponsors.
PUB DATE 11 Aug 94
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (77th, Atlanta, GA, August 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Censorship; *Freedom of Speech; *High Schools; High School Students; Journalism; Legislators; National Surveys; *School Publications; State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS Research Suggestions; *Scholastic Journalism; *State Legislators

ABSTRACT

A survey of 22 state legislators nationwide investigated what attitudes or characteristics distinguish successful from unsuccessful legislators in their attempts to pass free press legislation for high school journalists. Seven legislators successful in passing such legislation were asked 20 questions by phone. Surveys were also mailed to 28 unsuccessful legislators; 15 were returned. Results made two demographic distinctions between (1) those legislators supporting free press legislation and those not supporting it; and (2) those successful in supporting it and those not successful. The first set of results showed that supporters were disproportionately educated, members of the Democratic party, and women. Over half had teaching experience and experience as a high school journalist. The second set of results showed that those who were successful considered this legislation to be more important than other legislation; telephone interviews strongly suggested that successful supporters seemed to be more personally committed. Based on data from this study, the ideal legislative sponsor might have some of the following characteristics: personal experience with journalism; experience as an educator; accurate knowledge of high school journalism; ability to cross party lines; and experience as a legislator (someone with "clout"). Further research could determine how students, teachers, and administrators have helped to pass free press legislation. (Contains four tables of data, 24 references, and appendixes with the phone questionnaire and the mail survey.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 460

State High School Press Freedom Laws: A Profile of Legislative Sponsors

Lyle D. Olson
Department of Journalism and Mass Communication
South Dakota State University

Roger Van Ommeren
Division of Business and Communication
Mississippi University for Women

Marshel Rossow
Mass Communications Insitute
Mankato State University

A paper presented to the Scholastic Journalism Division,
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Atlanta

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

August 11, 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. D. Olson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: LEGISLATOR PROFILE

CS214537

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study identifies characteristics of state legislators who sponsored high school press freedom laws and examines the differences between legislators who have successfully sponsored such laws and those who have not been successful. In addition, this study provides charactertistics of the "ideal" legislative sponsor for concerned journalism educators in states that have not yet initiated efforts to pass student press freedom legislation.

State High School Press Freedom Laws: A Profile of Legislative Sponsors

The legal battleground for students' rights of free expression shifted from the federal courts to state legislatures after the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Hazelwood School District vs. Kuhlmeier*. Concerned journalism educators and state legislators in at least 28 states have attempted to reverse the adverse effects of the January 1988 decision.

These efforts have been successful in four states: Massachusetts in 1988, Iowa in 1989, Colorado in 1990, and Kansas in 1992. California has had a student free expression law since 1977. In addition, student press freedom provisions exist in the Pennsylvania School Code. The provisions, in existence before *Hazelwood*, were unnecessary when the *Tinker vs. Des Moines Independent Community School District* case was the standard, but became useful after the 1988 decision.

This study asked the questions: What are the characteristics of state legislators who sponsor anti-*Hazelwood* legislation? Are there discernible differences between the legislators who successfully sponsored legislation and those who have not been successful?

Literature review: scholastic journalism

The authors examined literature in two areas—scholastic journalism and political science.

Since 1988, a considerable amount of research and analysis has been done to assess the impact of the *Hazelwood* decision on high school journalism. Dvorak, Lain, and Dickson's *Journalism kids do better* contains a thorough reference list (46 citations spanning more than 11 pages with a synopsis of each entry) under the heading "Legal issues relating to *Hazelwood*."

An examination of recent publications indicated *Hazelwood* is being attacked on at least three main fronts: (1) scholastic press association leaders and high school advisers are seeking to gain the attention of the professional press, (2) journalism educators are pushing press freedom legislation, and (3) high school journalists are attacking *Hazelwood*.

On the first front, in a cover story in the March 1993 *ASNE Bulletin*, McFarlin said that high school journalism was in trouble and its framework was leaning. "Newspaper editors," she wrote, "are key members of the salvage crew that can keep it from falling" (p. 5). ASNE's Education for Journalism Committee, which McFarlin chaired, produced a tabloid report, "Rescuing high school journalism," which was distributed during the 1993 March ASNE convention and mailed to members.

The Freedom Forum's *Death by cheeseburger* will help spread the message of high school journalism to newspaper editors. The Freedom Forum concluded that editorial and financial restrictions on high school newspapers are mounting.

On the second *Hazelwood* battlefront, concerned journalism educators are pushing for passage of state free-expression laws that would limit the prior restraint and censorship authority of school officials. Henry (1990) and Overbeck (1977) discussed the efforts of individual states to pass legislation. Henry wrote that the successful passage of Senate Bill 99 in Colorado was "due to a broad coalition of high school newspaper advisers, students, teachers, educators' associations, and concerned individuals who charted largely unfamiliar political waters" (p. 14). Overbeck, an attorney, examined what he called "a remarkable first instance of any state setting up specific statutory safeguards for the freedom of official school newspapers" (p. 1). In 1993, Olson, Van Ommeren, and Rossow compared the five existing laws.

Although little academic research has examined efforts to pass high school press legislation, organizations and individuals have tracked such activity. For instance, the Student Press Law Center and AEJMC's Scholastic Journalism Division's Professional

Responsibility and Freedom Committee maintain up-to-date records of state efforts. In addition, unpublished material is available. For example, Mary Arnold, executive director of the Iowa High School Press Association, supplies a packet of material from her state's successful effort to interested journalism educators.

On a third front, high school journalists are attacking *Hazelwood*. Adler, an associate of ASNE's legal counsel, reported, "With a ferocity that should put some of their mainstream professional elders to shame, high school journalists are fighting a variety of battles in defense of student press freedom" (p. 8).

Dickson's study suggested that "editors and other student journalists are not avoiding controversial topics. However, they may be approaching them more carefully." The study shows "that the student press can still thrive despite the [*Hazelwood*] ruling" (p. 15).

Literature review: political science

Political science literature contains research pertinent to this study in three main areas: how to work with legislators, the decision-making process of legislators, and how legislators get their information.

In "How to testify before Congress," Heftel (1984) described techniques for making effective presentations before legislative committees. In "Lobby is not a four-letter word," Whaples and Waugaman (1982) suggested that the most effective lobbying methods are personal visits to the legislator's office, telephone calls, letters, contacts by other legislators, testifying at hearings, and telegrams. Less effective methods are contact at social affairs, media, and petitions.

The literature on decision-making reveals that legislators' personal feelings and values are keys to their decision-making process. Roberson, et al. (1992) found that on 22 of 26 education-related bills studied, personal feelings were the most important influence on the education policy decisions of Virginia legislators.

Songer, et al. (1986) found that the most common influence on the decisions of Kansas and Oklahoma legislators was their own personal values.

Jewell (1982) reported that "some legislators rely more consistently on their own judgment and others are more sensitive to constituent demands," leading to stereotyping of some as trustees and others as delegates. He summarized research which suggested that a number of personal variables affect legislators' representative roles. Psychological factors, for example, appear to give some legislators more confidence in their own judgment. There is also some evidence, although statistically weak, that "legislators with higher education and higher status occupations are more likely to be trustees" (pp. 104-105).

In studies of decision-making in legislatures, the source of information is a widely investigated aspect of information flow. Numerous studies examine the concept of cueing—a process in which legislators seek advice from other legislators. According to Matthews and Stimson:

> When a member is confronted with the necessity of casting a roll-call vote on a complex issue about which he knows very little, he searches for cues provided by trusted colleagues who—because of their formal position in the legislature or policy specialization—have more information than he does and with whom he would probably agree if he had the time and information to make an independent decision. (1975, p. 45)

Hurwitz (1988) found that legislators typically rely on several sources, depending on the issue, and "do not, then, consistently utilize the same source," a finding in contrast to the assumption of the Matthews and Stimson model (p. 215). He also found that legislators with "intense policy preferences ... seek cues from policy specialists, while those who believe that an issue is salient to their district will be more likely to seek cues from sources who can provide information about their district's preferences" (p. 212).

Kingdon (1989) identified "unorthodox information searches." Mooney (1991) explained that the legislative process is primarily an oral culture, and when a legislator does anything more than just talk to someone about an issue, he or she has gone beyond the "normal" information search pattern. Such a legislator shows a greater than average interest in the issue. Also, "written information can be both stored and organized for more timely and accurate retrieval . . . and it can contain more detailed and elaborate intelligence" (p. 434).

Kingdon concluded that those who conduct unorthodox information searches have "disproportionate influence on [legislative] outcomes" (p. 223). Mooney said that "those who use written information in state legislatures tend to be a bill's sponsor, a senior legislator, and/or a member or leader of the committee to which it was referred. . . . These are clearly the most influential legislators on a given bill's progress" (p. 434).

Mooney examined the sources of written information that state legislators use. He hypothesized that "the sources of legislative information, from the most to the least proximate, are as follows: fellow legislators, legislative staff, interest groups, executive agencies of the same state government, other governments, mass media, private citizens, and academics" (p. 435). His continuum was fairly accurate—in his study 70 percent of the written information legislators used came from fellow legislators, executive agencies, and interest groups (p. 439).

In another study, Thomas and Welch (1991) explained that earlier studies of gender differences revealed that most women state legislators were "shunted into or chose to specialize in areas of traditional female concern, such as education or health and welfare" (p. 446). In their survey of legislators in 12 states, Thomas and Welch found that "Women and men are equally active in a variety of routine legislative activity measures and do not differ to a significant extent in introduction and passage of bills" (p. 454).

In summary, political science literature reveals that

- the most effective lobbying methods are personal visits to the legislator's office, telephone calls, letters, contacts by other legislators, testifying at hearings, and telegrams.
- legislators' personal feelings are very important to their decision-making process.
- some legislators rely more consistently on their own judgment while others are more sensitive to constituent demands (trustees versus delegates).
- legislators with higher education are more likely to be trustees.
- although legislators seek advice from trusted colleagues (cueing), they generally do not use just one source, but instead rely on several.
- if legislators have policy concerns, they seek cues from policy specialists. If they have constituent concerns, they seek sources who can provide information about their district's preferences.
- when legislators go beyond oral information and seek written information, they become increasingly influential.
- legislators rely heavily on fellow legislators, executive agencies, and interest groups for written information, but they do not rely on the mass media, private citizens, or academics.
- legislative activities of women have achieved parity with men.

Methodology

This paper gathered demographic data on state legislators who have sponsored or are currently sponsoring state high school free-expression laws. In addition, the authors asked the legislators why they sponsored such legislation, why their efforts succeeded or failed, what they would do differently, and what suggestions they have for concerned journalism educators and legislators in other states.

The survey population was small, so inferential statistics were not used. Because interval data was not necessary and because the authors wanted to keep the

questionnaire simple and concise for legislators, a number of questions asked for "yes" or "no" responses. The objective of the descriptive survey was to provide a profile of legislative sponsors. Also, the survey sought reasons why Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, and Massachusetts were successful in passing legislation after the *Hazelwood* decision and more than 20 states have not been successful.

From November 1992 until January 1993, the authors conducted telephone interviews of six of nine legislators who sponsored successful bills in California, Colorado, Kansas, and Iowa. In early 1994, a seventh legislator from Massachusetts, now out of office, was interviewed by telephone.

The telephone survey (Appendix A) asked 20 questions about each legislator's reasons for sponsoring student press legislation, about the content of the bill, and various other questions about high school journalism in his or her state, plus demographic questions about political affiliation, constituency, years as a legislator, education, and high school, college or professional experience in journalism.

A recent report from the Student Press Law Center (SPLC) summarized the efforts of 24 states to pass anti-*Hazelwood* legislation. (The report also indicated that legislators planned to introduce bills in Arizona and Indiana in 1994 and that legislation was pending as of January 1994 in Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Michigan, and Wisconsin.)

Using the names of legislators on SPLC reports, the authors mailed a questionnaire in mid-February to 28 legislators (or former legislators) who so far have unsuccessfully sponsored student free-expression bills. On March 7, a personalized letter and copy of the questionnaire was faxed to those who had not responded. Ten days later an additional attempt was made via telephone to obtain surveys from legislators in three states listed in the SPLC report as having legislation pending in 1994. This additional attempt resulted in one response.

The mail questionnaire (Appendix B) contained the same items as the telephone survey plus a few additional questions such as "What, in your opinion, are some of the reasons the legislation failed?"

Of the 28 surveys mailed, 15 (54 percent) were returned. The SPLC report listed 24 states; however, one state did not have a legislator's name listed and repeated attempts to contact a former legislator in another state failed. Of the remaining 22 states, surveys were returned from 13 (59 percent).

Combining the telephone and mail responses, the authors' received feedback from 22 of 37 legislators (59 percent) representing 18 of 27 states (67 percent). Of the 22 who responded, four were no longer in office; of the 15 non-respondents, three were out of office.

Demographic data

State legislators who sponsored anti-*Hazelwood* legislation are overwhelmingly Democrat, well educated, and generally experienced. In addition, more than half have had both teaching experience and experience as a high school journalist.

Of the 22 respondents, 86 percent are Democrat and 14 percent are Republican. Political affiliation of the non-respondents is 87 percent Democrat and 13 percent Republican. These percentages differ markedly from the 1993-94 national breakdown of 58 percent Democrats and 40 percent Republicans among the 7,424 legislators in state governments (State elective officials, p. vi). Fourteen of the respondents are representatives, seven are senators, and one introduced the legislation as a senator, but is now lieutenant governor.

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents are male and 41 percent are female, while 80 percent of the non-respondents are male and 20 percent are female. Combined, 68 percent of the legislators who sponsored anti-*Hazelwood* legislation are male, while 32 percent are female, considerably higher than the national average of about 17 percent

female representation in state legislatures nationwide in 1991 (Thomas and Welch, p. 445).

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents indicated their occupation was either a teacher or an educator or that they had taught at some time in their career. One legislator had been a high school English teacher and yearbook adviser for 15 years. Two others had advised high school publications and a third was a part-time journalism teacher.

Nineteen percent indicated they were full-time politicians. Other occupations included two attorneys, a producer, a minister, a broadcaster, a solid waste contractor, and one legislator who had been a "teacher, musician, judge, state assemblyman, and state senator."

Some legislatures have longer sessions, better staffs, and full- or more nearly full-time members. The *Book of states* (1992-93 edition, p. 189) identifies states in which individual legislators are provided with staff help year-round, during legislative sessions only, or not at all. Of the five states that have anti-*Hazelwood* legislation, two provide staff year-round (California and Massachusetts), two provide staff during the sessions only (Iowa and Kansas), and one provides no staff (Colorado). Of the 22 states that have not been successful, 59 percent provide staff year-around, nine percent provide staff during the sessions only, and 32 percent provide no staff.

Forty-five percent of the respondents described their constituency as urban, 25 percent as a rural-urban mix, 20 percent as suburban, and 10 percent as rural. All of the respondents have a college education: 24 percent have a doctorate, 57 percent have a master's degree, and 19 percent hold a bachelor's degree.

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents have been in office five or more years. Fourteen percent have been in office more than 20 years, 34 percent 11 to 20 years, 29 percent five to 10 years, 19 percent two to four years, and five percent one year.

Fifty-eight percent of the legislators had been in office five years or more when their bill was passed or proposed, while 21 percent had been in office two to four years and 21 percent one year or less.

Fifty-two percent of the respondents had high school journalism experience via a student newspaper or yearbook or through journalism classes, while 30 percent had college journalism experience and 24 percent had professional journalism experience. This demographic data is summarized in Table One.

Differences between groups

The descriptive data seems to indicate that there are no outstanding differences in party affiliation, gender, education, years in legislature, college journalism experience, or professional journalism experience between successful and non-successful legislators.

There are, however, four areas in which the differences appear to be more marked—make up of constituency, career experience, high school journalism experience, and years in office when the legislation was proposed. Table Two summarizes these differences.

Overall, legislators described their constituency as rural (10 percent), urban (45 percent), rural-urban mix (25 percent), and suburban (20 percent). Legislators from the successful states were more evenly divided among the four choices—14, 28.5, 28.5, and 28.5 percent respectively—compared to legislators from the non-successful states—8, 54, 23, and 15. The latter group had a much higher percentage of urban constituency. Research into rural-urban differences in legislative decision-making is inconclusive (Tickamyer, 1983), so it is not wise to speculate as to whether or not this difference is important.

As mentioned, 57 percent of the respondents either indicated their current occupation as a teacher/educator or that they had formerly taught. There were differences, however, between the groups as 71 percent of the successful legislators had teaching experience compared to 50 percent for the other group. Seventy-one percent

of the legislators who successfully sponsored high school press freedom laws had high school journalism experience, compared to 43 percent of the legislators who had not been successful and who had high school experience.

In addition, 31 percent of the respondents who were unsuccessful introduced the legislation in their first year in office; none of the successful legislators introduced student free-expression bills in their first year.

Opinions of legislators

Beyond demographic data, the surveys gathered additional information about anti-*Hazelwood* legislation and the opinions of the state legislators who sponsor it. The summary data again reports on both groups, summarized in Table Three, then examines how the responses from the successful and non-successful legislators differ.

The authors asked legislators if they found, or expected to find, support from other legislators to be "easy to enlist" (five percent), "difficult to enlist" (47 percent), or "about like most legislation" (47 percent).

Sixty-seven percent said that "legislation to provide freedom of the press to high school publications" is "about as important as most other legislation," while 29 percent said it was "more important than most other legislation." Five percent said it was "not as important as most other legislation."

Respondents were asked to indicate why they sponsored (or are sponsoring) high school press legislation. They were given six possible responses and could check all that apply. With 18 responses, "because of concern for students' first amendment rights" was the reason selected most often, followed by two responses with 10 each: "because of the *Hazelwood* ruling" and "because of encouragement from high school publications advisers." Nine legislators selected "because of my personal experience with journalism.""Because of lobbying from high school press associations" was selected only three times. One legislator specified prompting from the American Civil

Liberties Union as his reason. No legislators said professional journalists prompted their bill.

Seventy-five percent of the legislators said their high school press legislation was a consequence of the *Hazelwood* decision while 25 percent said it was not.

The authors asked legislators what problem or problems the *Hazelwood* decision created. It "imposed unreasonable restrictions on student press freedoms" was the most cited reason with 18 responses, followed by it "made an unwarranted distinction between student and adult rights" with 12 responses and it "made the principal a publisher" with 11. Eight respondents said it "held student expression to a higher standard than expected of adults" and seven said it "made high school press freedom an education issue instead of a first amendment issue."

What was prohibited by the legislation? Sixteen legislators checked "dissemination of obscene information," 15 checked "prior review/restraint unless guidance voluntarily sought by student," nine checked "violation of any lawful school regulation," seven checked "invasion of privacy," and four checked "advertising for illegal products and services."

What factors were of special concern when they designed their bill? Eighteen legislators selected "student staff freedom to determine the content of a publication," while 12 selected "protection for the faculty adviser from libel," and nine chose "a written policy on press freedoms to be provided to students." Five selected "protection for students from libel" and four selected "a specially qualified adviser or teacher."

The authors asked legislators who received the mail questionnaire "who was responsible for the wording of the bill?" Seventy-seven percent said "it was a team effort with several individuals involved," including other legislators, state high school press association directors, and journalism teachers/advisers. One respondent each said the ACLU, the Iowa law, and other state statues were responsible. Notably absent was

input from professional media—no legislators said professional journalists helped draft their bill.

What areas should high school press freedom extend to? Seventy percent of the legislators said "all forms of expression including buttons, badges, and arm bands." The remaining 30 percent selected variously among newspapers, yearbooks, magazines, and broadcast media.

Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision? Seventy percent of the legislators said "no," 20 percent said "yes," and 10 percent were undecided. These percentages are similar to the response of high school press association directors to a similar item in a 1992 survey. Sixty-four percent of the directors disagreed with the statement "High school journalists should be given freedom to report on any issue without supervision" (Olson, Van Ommeren, Rossow, p. 11).

Did (or does) your bill assume high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism? Sixty-one percent said "yes," 33 percent said "no," and six percent were unsure.

Did (or does) your bill presume high school journalists are aware of their responsibilities as journalists? Seventy-two percent of the legislators said "yes" and 28 percent said "no."

In sponsoring the bill, was (or is) it your intention that high school journalists should exercise First Amendment rights on their publications only with the supervision of their advisers? Eighty-eight percent of the legislators said "yes."

Do you believe high school journalism advisers and teachers in your state are adequately prepared to advise high school publications? Eighty-five percent of the legislators said "yes." Only one legislator said "no." Two noted "some are, some aren't." This response contrasts sharply from the survey of state high school press association directors in which 69 percent disagreed with the statement that "most high

school journalism teachers and advisers in my state are adequately prepared to advise high school publications" (Olson, Van Ommeren, Rossow, p. 11).

Seventy-four percent of the legislators believe that journalism is generally treated as an extracurricular activity in their state. Twenty-one percent said it is an important part of the curriculum and five percent said that it depends on the school. This finding is similar to the survey of scholastic press association directors, in which 62 percent agreed that "schools in my state are likely to treat journalism courses as an extracurricular activity" while 28 percent disagreed (p. 10).

Ninety-five percent of the legislators agreed that the professional press in their state should support high school journalism programs. Again, this response matches the strong message from state high school press association directors (Van Ommeren, Olson, Rossow, 1992, p. 48).

Four items dealt specifically with control of high school publications. Should high school journalism advisers review all stories before they are printed? Eighty-four percent of the legislators said "yes." In comparison, 67 percent of the state high school press association directors agreed with the statement "High school journalism advisers should review all copy before it is printed" (Olson, Van Ommeren, Rossow, p. 11).

Should school administrators exercise any control over the content of high school publications? Ninety-four percent of the legislators said "no." Who should exercise control over high school publications? Legislators were given six options to rank—students, teachers/advisers, parents, school administrators, courts, and school boards. The overwhelming response was that students themselves should be the primary authority, followed by teachers/advisers. Again, this finding parallels the response from state high school press association directors (Olson, Van Ommeren, Rossow, p. 11).

A final question asked "If high school students are given freedom to publish without an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters who have to abide by the judgments of editors?" Sixty-three

percent of the legislators said "yes," 25 percent said "no," and six percent were unsure. One respondent said there is "not a parallel at all" between high school journalism and the professional press. "In a public school, the principal is an agent of the state, and it is simply not appropriate for government/state employees to tell students what they can or cannot say. In a commercial operation, the publisher is not an agent of the state."

Differences between groups

Again, on this section of the survey about the legislation itself and the opinions of its sponsors, it is useful to separate the responses of the legislators from California, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, and Massachusetts and the responses of legislators from states that have not passed anti-*Hazelwood* legislation. On most survey items, there was little difference between the two groups and, in fact, several times the percentages were virtually identical. However, there are some areas in which marked differences do occur. These differences are summarized in Table Four.

As might be expected, legislative sponsors whose bills passed indicated that enlisting support from other legislators was easier than the lawmakers whose bills had not passed. One successful legislator said support was "easy to enlist"; no unsuccessful legislator checked that response. Only one successful legislator said that support was "difficult to enlist" while eight unsuccessful legislators (57 percent) checked that response.

Overall, 67 percent of the respondents felt student press freedom legislation was "about as important as most other legislation" and 29 percent said it was more important. The differences between groups, however, is more tell.ng. Fifty-seven percent of the successful legislators said the legislation was more important compared to 14 percent of the legislators whose bills had not yet been successful.

Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision? Eighty-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" while 62 percent of the unsuccessful legislators said "no."

Did (or does) your bill assume that high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism? Seventy-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" while 71 percent in the other group said "yes." Did (or does) your bill presume high school journalists are aware of their responsibilities as journalists? Seventy-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" while 86 percent in the other group said "yes."

Overall, 74 percent of the legislators believed that schools in their state generally treated journalism as an extracurricular activity. Fifty-seven percent of the successful legislators (more closely paralleling the 62 percent response of state high school press association directors) believed this to be true compared to 83 percent in the other group.

If high school students are given freedom to publish without an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters who have to abide by the judgments of editors? Eighty percent of the successful legislators responded "yes" compared to 55 percent from the other group.

Why legislation failed

The legislators who received the mail questionnaire were asked: What is the current status of your involvement with high school press freedom legislation? Only one respondent said that the legislation she sponsored had failed and "I do not plan to try again." Seven legislators said they were currently reintroducing legislation that failed to pass previously; four others said they plan to try again.

What, according to those who received the mail survey, are some of the reasons why high school press freedom legislation failed in their states? Legislators were given five reasons to select and an "other" blank to add their own. With 11 responses, "opposition from school boards and teacher organizations" was the reason selected most often. Several respondents added "principal" and "superintendent's organizations" to this response.

One legislator noted that teachers were not a problem in her state, but the school board and superintendent organizations were. Another legislator, however, noted that he lost his re-election bid by 71 votes and attributed his defeat in part to lost support from teachers because he sponsored the press freedom bill. Another said, "School boards didn't do a lobbying job against us, but we didn't have much vocal support for us (except for the ACLU)."

Nine legislators selected "concern about unregulated high school publications" as a reason for failure. Four chose "lack of support from the professional media" and two selected "lack of interest among other legislators" and "lack of lobbyist activities among supporters." Two legislators wrote in strong "opposition from other legislators" as a key reason their bills failed.

If you are reintroducing legislation that failed previously, what are you doing differently? One legislator said, "We will not ask for the Judiciary Committee to take up the bill unless we are certain it has enough votes to be reported out. We don't want the bill to be amended to provide for prior review."

Another said, "In the past, the Senate has been the killer of such legislation. I need to work on senators and get the legislation introduced there also to begin the process."

A reintroduced version will "put more responsibility for review on advisers" and "will remove free speech portions, i.e., badges, musicals, etc.," wrote one respondent. One wrote, "we just cleaned up the language to make it clearer," while another plans to work with "boards prior to introduction."

One legislator said her reintroduced bill passed the House, but is stalled in the Senate and "we haven't determined our next best strategy." Concerning any new strategies, one legislator said "We don't know yet" and another said "No current plans."

Legislators' advice for other states

In another open-ended question, the legislators were asked if they had additional advice for concerned journalism educators and legislators in the nearly 20 states that have not launched efforts to pass high school press freedom legislation. Here are some of their tips:

- Start earlier, I wasn't approached until the start of the session.
- Discuss with and gain support from the school board and school administration.
- Contact your hometown legislator in person and ask for sponsorship.
- Make sure legislators understand normal rules can apply, rules which now govern professional news organizations, i.e., no slander or obscenity.
- Stick to press rights. Legislators see a red flag go up when buttons, badges, etc. are mentioned.
- Because this issue may be categorized as a conservative versus liberal debate, enlist the support of major opponents (i.e., conservatives).
- Need support of journalism teachers and advisers who are willing to work with their legislators.
- Discuss with and gain support from the state press association.
- Work hard and know your subject.
- Gather as much support as possible (i.e., National Council of Teachers of English, ACLU, Society of Professional Journalists, parents of high school journalists, and so forth).
- Enlist student journalists to speak on their own behalf.

Concerning the last suggestions, one respondent from a successful state said legislators were shocked when 100 students from active journalism programs came to a hearing and testified in favor of the bill. They were "very articulate and put on one

helluva show," winning over any legislators on the education committee who had resisted the bill.

Discussion

This study asked: What are the characteristics of state legislators who sponsor anti-*Hazelwood* legislation?

Demographic data answered the question. They are predominantly Democrat, are well educated, and are generally experienced legislators. Over half have had both teaching experience and experience as a high school journalist. They are fairly evenly divided between professional and citizen lawmakers and between the type of constituencies they represent.

They generally agree on why they chose to sponsor high school press legislation, what problems *Hazelwood* created, what the legislation they sponsored prohibits, what factors were of special concern when they designed the bill, who was responsible for the wording of the bill, and what areas student press freedom should extend to.

They also strongly agree that the professional press should support high school journalism and that the professional press provided little or no help in prompting and drafting the legislation. In addition, several legislators indicated they were puzzled by the professional press' response to the *Hazelwood* decision: apathetic in some cases, supportive in others.

The legislators who sponsored anti-*Hazelwood* legislation seem to be atypical of the "average" state lawmaker in several ways: There was a higher concentration of women and Democrats represented, and they were probably more highly educated. In addition, there was a higher percentage of educators represented and of former high school journalists than would be expected.

Are there discernible differences between the legislators who successfully sponsored legislation and those who have not been successful? This second question is more difficult to answer. Although the percentages seemed to indicate several areas in

which the successful and non-successful legislators differ, the small population makes conclusions tenuous.

Political science literature revealed that the personal feelings and values of lawmakers are an extremely important factor in their decision-making process. The intangible personal aspect factor may be the key difference between the successful and non-successful sponsors of anti-*Hazelwood* legislation. The fact that more than four times as many successful legislators (57 percent versus the other group's 14 percent) said the legislation was "more important than most other legislation" indicated that the successful legislators may have been more personally committed to the legislation.

This "personal" factor came out clearly via the telephone interviews as six of the seven successful legislators told about personal involvement in high school journalism that helped spark their interest in sponsoring anti-*Hazelwood* legislation. As a high school newspaper editor, one legislator had faced potential censorship and it "left an impression on me." He read about *Hazelwood* in the *New York Times* and was "personally appalled. . . . It rubbed me the wrong way and drudged up a latent feeling of vehement reaction." He said to himself, "We're going to do something about it" and in 1988 an anti-*Hazelwood* law was passed in his state.

After reading about the *Hazelwood* decision in the *Des Moines Register*, another legislator immediately called his friend, a lobbyist for the ACLU, and that day they decided to do something, which included contacting their state's high school press association director. This legislator's wife was a high school publications adviser and his friend, the lobbyist, had faced administrative displeasure in high school over a press rights issue.

Another successful legislator had a bachelor's, master's and doctorate in English, had majored in journalism for two years, had taught high school English for 15 years, and had advised the school's yearbook. She had been a newspaper editor in high

school, yearbook editor in college, a member of the Society of Professional Journalists, and is now a freelance writer.

Another legislator, a high school government teacher for 18 years, cited *Tinker vs. Des Moines* in his teaching. He had a daughter who faced a censorship issue on her high school newspaper. Two other successful legislators, both teachers, had also advised high school publications.

A few of the non-successful legislators indicated via their comments on the mail survey that they felt student press freedom was important, but a deeper personal involvement and commitment to the legislation came through much more clearly from the legislators in the five successful states.

The differences in responses between successful and non-successful sponsors of anti-*Hazelwood* legislation on several other items seems to indicate that perhaps the successful legislators were not only more personally involved, but also more knowledgeable about the true picture of high school journalism. For instance, 57 percent of the successful legislators believe that schools in their state generally treated journalism as an extracurricular activity (close to the 62 percent response of state high school press association directors) compared to 83 percent of the legislators in the other group.

The response of successful legislators to three other items also seems to indicate that they better understand the guiding and teaching role of an adviser. Eighty-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" to "Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision?" while 62 percent of the unsuccessful legislators said "no." Seventy-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" to "Did (or does) your bill assume that high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism?" while 71 percent in the other group said "yes." A similar reversal occurred in response to "Did (or does) your bill presume high

school journalists are aware of their responsibilities as journalists?" Seventy-five percent of the successful legislators said "no" while 86 percent in the other group said "yes."

Cue research in political science indicated the value of an experienced legislative sponsor. This study supported that assertion. Nearly one third of the respondents who were unsuccessful introduced the legislation in their first year in office; none of the successful legislators introduced bills in their first year.

Based on the data from this study, the "ideal" legislative sponsor might have some of the following characteristics:

- personal experience with journalism in high school.
- experience as an educator.[1]
- knowledge beyond the "normal" information search pattern Kingdon described and, armed with more detailed information, would have "disproportionate influence on [legislative] outcomes" (p. 223).
- experience as a legislator and, thus, a colleague who has developed credibility and who could fill the cueing role for legislators concerned about policy matters or constituent concerns.
- accurate knowledge of high school journalism (i.e., the qualifications and proper role of an adviser).
- the ability to cross party lines and deflate the "liberal vs. conservative" stigma that high school press legislation attracts.

Conclusion

This profile of legislative sponsors helps to chart what Henry called "largely unfamiliar political waters" (p. 15) for concerned journalism educators who wish to initiate the passage of student free-expression laws in their states.

At least one more step remains: a survey of state high school press association directors, journalism teachers/advisers, and students who have been actively involved in efforts to pass anti-*Hazelwood* legislation. Insights from these individuals will help

explain why some states have been successful and why efforts have failed or stalled elsewhere.

Future research also could examine the states that have laws to see if they indeed reduce the incidences of censorship. If they don't, the results may not be worth the effort expended and perhaps that effort should be put into other areas that might be more fruitful, such as promoting adviser training and certification requirements. In addition, scholastic journalism educators could examine more closely the reasons why the professional press did not oppose the *Hazelwood* decision (see "Editorials support censorship decision," 1988), and then put a concerted effort into addressing those concerns.

Obtaining insights to these and other questions will not only help in the battle against the adverse effects of the *Hazelwood* decision on student press freedoms, but will also help to bolster increasingly beleaguered high school journalism programs around the country.

Notes

[1]"Educators as lawmakers: a directory of state legislators from the education profession" (1986-87) edition, an excellent source to identify legislators who have an education background, is unfortunately out of print and has not been updated. It included data on more than 800 legislators who enacted policy in their state from the perspective of an educator. With occupation as a starting point, a summary was developed for each legislator from the education profession. These summaries included his/her chamber and party affiliation, address, telephone number, and, when available, alma mater and committee assignments. The directory was published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Washington, DC.

References

Adler, A. (1993, March). State legislatures, courts and Congress are all engaged in staking out limits on the student press. *ASNE Bulletin*, pp. 8-9.

Book of states: 1992-93 edition. The Council of State Governments: Lexington, KY.

Dickson, T. (1993). Have student journalists become "journalistic wimps"? C:*JET*, 26:3, pp. 13-15.

Dvorak, J., L. Lain and T. Dickson. (1994). Journalism kids do better: What research tells us about high school journalism:. ERIC/REC Clearinghouse: Bloomington, IN.

Death by cheeseburger: High school journalism in the 1990s and beyond. (1994). The Freedom Forum: Arlington, VA.

Editorials support censorship decision. (1988, Jan. 23). *Editor & Publisher*, p. 11.

Heftel, C. (1984). How to testify before Congress. *AGB Reports*, 26:4, pp. 35-39.

Henry, F. (1990). Passage of Colorado bill attributed to coalition; political networking shows the little guy can win. *C:JET*, 24:1, 14-15.

Hurwitz, J. (1988). Determinants of legislative cue selection. *Social Science Quarterly*, 69:1, pp. 212-223.

Jewell, M. (1982). Representation in state legislatures. The University Press of Kentucky: Lexington, KY.

Kingdon, J. (1989). Congressmen's voting decisions. 3rd ed. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI.

Matthews, D. and J. Stimson. (1975). Yeas and nays. Wiley: New York.

McFarlin, D. (1993, Ma.ch). Limits on high school journalism are spreading, getting stronger. *ASNE Bulletin*, pp. 4-7.

Mooney, C. (1991). Peddling information in the state legislature: Closeness counts. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 44:2, pp. 433-443.

Olson, L., R. Van Ommeren and M. Rossow. (1992). The nation's scholastic press association directors describe the state of high school journalism. *C:JET*, 26:3, pp. 10-12.

Overbeck, W. (1977). Protecting student press freedom by state law: The experience in California. Paper presented to the Secondary Education Divison, AEJMC, Madison, WI.

Roberson, S., et al. (1992). Influences that shape state legislators' education policy decisions. *ERS Spectrum*, 10:1, pp. 30-34.

Songer, D., et al. (1986). The influence of issues on choices of voting cues utilized by state legislators. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 39:1, pp. 118-125.

State elective officials and the legislatures: 1993-94. The Council of State Governments: Lexington, KY.

Thomas, S. and S. Welch. (1991). The imact of gender of activities and priorities of state legislators. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 44:2, pp. 445-455.

Tickamyer, A. (1983). Rural-urban influences on legislative power and decision making. *Rural Sociology*, 48:1, pp. 133-147.

Van Ommeren, R., L. Olson and M. Rossow. (1992, Jan. 11). The nation's high school press association directors describe the relationship between high school journalism and the professionals. Paper presented at the mid-winter meeting of the Secondary Education Division, AEJMC, Nashville.

Van Ommeren, R., L. Olson and M. Rossow. (1992). High school journalism—educational tool or extracurricular trash? *Editor & Publisher*, Dec. 12, pp. 48, 37.

Whaples, G. and D. Waugaman. (1982). Lobby is not a four-letter word: The future of adult education depends on your effectiveness. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years*, 5:8, pp. 4-5.

TABLE ONE

Demographic Summary of Sponsors of State High School Press Freedom Legislation

Party
- 86% Democrat
- 14% Republication

Sex
- 59% Male
- 41% Female

Education
- 24% Doctorate
- 57% Master's degree
- 19% Bachelor's degree

Position
- 64% Representative
- 36% Senator

Constituency
- 45% Urban
- 25% Rural-urban mix
- 20% Suburban
- 10% Rural

Occupation
- 57% Current or former teacher
- 19% Full-time politician

Journalism experience
- 52% High school
- 30% College
- 24% Professional

Years in office
- 5% One
- 19% Two to four
- 29% Five to 10
- 34% 11 to 20
- 14% More than 20

Years in office when student press legislation was introduced
- 58% Five or more
- 21% Two to four
- 21% One or less

n ranged from 19 to 22

TABLE TWO

Demographic Differences Between Successful and Unsuccessful Sponsors of State High School Press Freedom Legislation

Constituency

	Rural	Urban	Rural-urban mix	Suburban
Overall	10%	45%	25%	20%
Successful	14%	28.5%	28.5%	28.5%
Unsuccessful	8%	54%	23%	15%

Career experience

	Current or former teacher/educator
Overall	57%
Successful	71%
Unsuccessful	50%

Journalism experience

	In high school
Overall	52%
Successful	71%
Unsuccessful	43%

Years in office when legislation was introduced

	First year
Successful	0%
Unsuccessful	31%

TABLE THREE

Opinions of State Legislators Who Sponsored State High School Press Freedom Legislation

Support from other legislators was

5% Easy to enlist
47% Difficult to enlist
47% About like most legislation

Student press freedom legislation is

67% About as important as other legislation
29% More important
5% Not as important

Sponsorship is a result of the *Hazelwood* decision

75% Yes
25% No

Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision?

70% No
20% Yes
10% Undecided

What areas should high school press freedom include?

70% All forms of expression, including buttons, badges, and arm bands
30% Selected variously among newspapers, yearbooks, magazines, broadcast

Did your bill assume high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism?

61% Yes
33% No
6% Unsure

Did your bill assume high school journalists are aware of their responsiblities as journalists?

72% Yes
28% No

Was it your intention that high school journalists should exercise their First Amendment rights only with the supervision of advisers?

88% Yes
12% No

Do you believe journalism advisers/teachers in your state are adequately prepared to advise high school publications?

85% Yes
5% No
10% Some are, some aren't

Who was responsible for the wording of the bill?

77% Team effort

Do schools in your state generally treat journalism as an extracurricular activity or as an important part of the curriculum?

74% Extracurricular
21% Important
5% Depends on school

Do you believe the professional press in your state should support high school journalism programs?

95% Yes
5% No

Should high school journalism advisers review all stories before they are printed?

84% Yes
16% No

Should school administrators exercise any control over the content of high school publications?

94% No
6% Yes

If high school journalists are given freedom to publish without an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters?

63% Yes
25% No
6% Unsure

n ranged from 16 to 21

TABLE FOUR

Opinion Differences Between Successful and Unsuccessful Sponsors of State High School Press Freedom Legislation

Support from other legislators was

	Successful	Unsuccessful
Easy to enlist	20%	0
Difficult to enlist	20%	57%

High school press freedom legislation is

	Successful	Unsuccessful
More important (compared to other legislation)	57%	14%

Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision?

	Successful	Unsuccessful
No	85%	62%

Did your bill assume high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism?

	Successful	Unsuccessful
Yes	25%	71%
No	75%	21%

Did your bill assume high school journalists are aware of their responsiblities as journalists?

	Successful	Unsuccessful
Yes	25%	86%
No	75%	14%

Do schools in your state generally treat journalism as an extracurricular activity or as an important part of the curriculum?

	Successful	Unsuccessful
Extracurricular	57%	83%
Important to curriculum	29%	17%

If high school journalists are given freedom to publish without an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters?

	Successful	Unsuccessful
Yes	80%	55%
No	20%	36%

Appendix A

Telephone questionnaire — State Legislators sponsoring high school press freedom bills California, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas and Massachusetts.
February-March 1993

Before calling legislators, read the law that was passed by that state and adapt the questionnaire-interview accordingly. Follow the structure of the questionnaire insofar as possible to maintain consistency in tabulating results. If a legislator sidesteps a question or answers vaguely, seek clarification if possible. Allow and encourage comments on items. Keep notes on separate note pad and number the comment to match the number of the questionnaire item that triggered the comment.

Name_____ State_____
Possible introduction: The 1988 Hazelwood decision denied the high school press freedoms granted to others. A number of legislators such as you have attempted to restore those freedoms. My colleagues and I are conducting this survey to determine as much as we can about such legislation, so we can share it with concerned educators. Through presentations and articles, we hope this information will encourage more such efforts.

1. How important is legislation to provide freedom of the press to high school publications in comparison to other issues you have to deal with:
   ( ) More important than most other legislation.
   ( ) About as important as most other legislation.
   ( ) Not as important as most other legislation.

2. Why did you sponsor high school press legislation? [May not have to read responses. If it fits a statement, check it. If not, write remarks on note pad.]
   ( ) Because of the Hazelwood ruling.
   ( ) Because of my personal experience with journalism.
   ( ) Because of concern for students' first amendment rights.
   ( ) Because of encouragement from high school publications advisers.
   ( ) Because of lobbying from high school press associations.
   ( ) Other (please specify) _____

3. Was your high school press freedom legislation a consequence of the Hazelwood ruling?

   ( ) yes ( ) no Comments: _____

4. In your opinion what problems did the Hazelwood decision create? [After comment, read responses.]
   ( ) Made an unwarranted distinction between student and adult rights.
   ( ) Imposed unreasonable restrictions on student press freedoms.
   ( ) Held student expression to a higher standard than expected of adults. [Matched to # 9 & 20)
   ( ) Made high school press freedom an education issue instead of a First Amendment issue.
   ( ) Made the principal a publisher.
   ( ) I am not familiar with the Hazelwood decision.

5. Could you briefly describe the legislation you sponsored in terms of your primary objectives? Precisely what did you seek to encourage and/or prohibit? [Might go over each item each for consistency and completeness.]
   ( ) Prior review or prior restraint unless guidance is voluntarily sought by the student.
   ( ) Dissemination of obscene information.
   ( ) Invasion of privacy.
   ( ) Violation of any lawful school regulation.
   ( ) Advertising for illegal products and services.

6. In designing your bill, were the following of special concern? (Adapt to state's law.)
   ( ) A specially qualified adviser or teacher.
   ( ) Student staff freedom to determine the content of a publication.
   ( ) Student staff freedom to determine the content of broadcasting.
   ( ) Protection for the faculty adviser from libel.
   ( ) Protection for students from libel.
   ( ) A written policy on press freedoms to be provided to students.

7. In your opinion should high school press freedom extend to [Check all that apply.]
( ) Newspapers ( ) Yearbooks ( ) Broadcast ( ) Magazines
( ) All forms of expression including buttons, badges and arm bands.

8. Did you find support from other legislators to be:
( ) Easy to enlist ( ) Difficult to enlist ( ) About like most legislation

9. Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without any supervision?
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

10. Did your bill assume high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism.
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

11. Did your bill presume high school journalists are aware of their responsibilities as journalists.
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

12. In sponsoring the bill, was it your intention that high school journalists should exercise First Amendment rights on their publications only with the supervision of their advisers.
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

13. Do you believe high school journalism advisers and teachers in your state are adequately prepared to advise high school publications.
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

14. Do your believe the schools in your state generally treat journalism as an extracurricular activity or as an important part of the curriculum?
( ) extracurricular ( ) important to curriculum ( ) other (see notes on separate sheet)

15. Do you believe the professional press in your state should supports high school journalism programs?
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

16. In your opinion should high school journalism advisers review all stories before they are printed.
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

17. Should school administrators exercise any control over the content of high school newspapers?
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

18. Who should exercise control of high school newspapers? Number as many as you believe are appropriate, starting with No. 1 as who you think should be the primary authority.
__students __teachers/advisers _____school administrators __school board
__parents __courts

19. To the best of your knowledge, has any of the following occurred in your state in the last 3 years? (Check all that apply.)
( ) High school publications have been censored.
( ) High school teachers have been reprimanded for journalism activities.
( ) High school students have been reprimanded for journalism activities.
( ) High school administrators have censored school publications.
( ) Libel suits have been filed or threatened against a high school newspaper.
( ) High school newspapers have acted irresponsibly.

20. If high school students are given freedom to publish without so much as an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters who have to abide by the judgments of editors? [Follow through with this question. Professional journalists did not seem alarmed by Hazelwood because they have to meet the requirements of editors. I hope to raise this question in the paper.]
( ) yes ( ) no ( ) see comments on separate sheet

Would you please answer the following questions concerning yourself.

21. Political affiliation:
( ) Democrat ( ) Republican ( ) Independent

22. Describe your constituency in the terms provided:
( ) rural ( ) urban ( ) rural-urban mix ( ) suburban

23. Occupation: _____

24. Education:
( ) high school or less ( ) vocational ( ) bachelor's
( ) master's ( ) doctorate

25. Years in Legislature:
( ) one ( ) 2-4 ( ) 5-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16-20 ( ) 20 or more

26. How long had you been in your elected position when the bill was passed?
( ) 1 year ( ) 2-4 ( ) 5-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16-20 ( ) 20 or more

27. High school journalism experience:
( ) newspaper ( ) yearbook ( ) journalism class(es)
( ) Other (please specify) _____

28. College journalism experience:
( ) newspaper ( ) yearbook ( ) journalism major
( ) journalism minor ( ) journalism class(es) ( ) journalism internship

29. Do you have professional journalism experience?
( ) none ( ) newspaper ( ) broadcast ( ) PR ( ) advertising
( ) magazine ( ) other (please list) _____

Describe position (e.g. reporter) _____

Appendix B

High School Press Freedom: A Survey of Key Legislators

Please use a (✔) to mark your answer unless otherwise indicated. We have left space on the last page for your comments on any items. Please circle the number of an item you want to comment on and refer to that number in making your comments at the end of the questionnaire.

1. How important is legislation to provide freedom of the press to high school publications compared with other issues with which you have to deal?
   ( ) More important than most other legislation.
   ( ) About as important as most other legislation.
   ( ) Not as important as most other legislation.

2. Why did you sponsor (or why are you sponsoring) high school press legislation? (check all that apply)
   ( ) Because of the Hazelwood ruling.
   ( ) Because of my personal experience with journalism.
   ( ) Because of concern for students' first amendment rights.
   ( ) Because of encouragement from high school publications advisers.
   ( ) Because of lobbying from high school press associations.
   ( ) Other (please specify) _____

3. Was (or is) your high school press freedom legislation a consequence of the Hazelwood ruling?
   ( ) yes ( ) no

4. In your opinion, what problems did the Hazelwood decision create? (check all that apply)
   ( ) Made an unwarranted distinction between student and adult rights.
   ( ) Imposed unreasonable restrictions on student press freedoms.
   ( ) Held student expression to a higher standard than expected of adults.
   ( ) Made high school press freedom an education issue instead of a First Amendment issue.
   ( ) Made the principal a publisher.
   ( ) I am not familiar with the Hazelwood decision.

5. The legislation you are sponsoring (or sponsored) prohibits: (check all that apply)
   ( ) Prior review or prior restraint unless guidance is voluntarily sought by the student.
   ( ) Dissemination of obscene information.
   ( ) Invasion of privacy.
   ( ) Violation of any lawful school regulation.
   ( ) Advertising for illegal products and services.
   ( ) Other (please specify) _____

6. In designing your bill, were the following of special concern? (check all that apply)
   ( ) A specially qualified adviser or teacher.
   ( ) Student staff freedom to determine the content of a publication.
   ( ) Student staff freedom to determine the content of broadcasting.
   ( ) Protection for the faculty adviser from libel.
   ( ) Protection for students from libel.
   ( ) A written policy on press freedoms to be provided to students.

7. Who was primarily responsible for the wording of the bill?
   ( ) Legislators (you and/or co-sponsors)
   ( ) A state high school press association director
   ( ) A journalism adviser/teacher in the state
   ( ) Professional media personnel
   ( ) It was a team effort with several individuals involved.
   ( ) Other (please specify) _____

(please continue on back side of this page)

8. In your opinion should high school press freedom extend to: (check all that apply)
( ) newspapers ( ) yearbooks ( ) broadcast ( ) magazines
( ) All forms of expression including buttons, badges and arm bands.

9. Should high school journalists be given freedom to print articles without supervision?
( ) yes ( ) no

10. Did (or does) your bill assume that high school students understand the legal considerations and ethics of journalism?
( ) yes ( ) no

11. Did (or does) your bill presume high school journalists are aware of their responsibilities as journalists?
( ) yes ( ) no

12. In sponsoring the bill, was (or is) it your intention that high school journalists should exercise First Amendment rights on their publications only with the supervision of their advisers?
( ) yes ( ) no

13. Do you believe high school journalism advisers and teachers in your state are adequately prepared to advise high school publications?
( ) yes ( ) no

14. Do you believe schools in your state generally treat journalism as an extracurricular activity or as an important part of the curriculum?
( ) extracurricular ( ) important to curriculum

15. Do you believe the professional press in your state should support high school journalism programs?
( ) yes ( ) no

16. Should high school journalism advisers review all stories before they are printed?
( ) yes ( ) no

17. Should school administrators exercise any control over the content of high school publications?
( ) yes ( ) no

18. Who should exercise control of high school publications? Number as many as you believe are appropriate, starting with No. 1 as who you think should be the primary authority.

__students __teachers/advisers __parents
__school administrators __courts __school board

19. To the best of your knowledge, has any of the following occurred in your state in the last 3 years? (check all that apply)
( ) High school administrators have censored school publications.
( ) High school teachers have been reprimanded for journalism activities.
( ) High school students have been reprimanded for journalism activities.
( ) Libel suits have been filed or threatened against a high school student publication.
( ) High school student publications have acted irresponsibly.

20. If high school students are given freedom to publish without an adviser evaluating their stories, are they being given greater freedom than professional reporters who have to abide by the judgments of editors?
( ) yes ( ) no

21. If you have sponsored (or are sponsoring) high school press legislation, did (or do) you expect to find support from other legislators to be
( ) easy to enlist ( ) difficult to enlist ( ) about like most legislation

(please continue on the next page)

22. What is the current status of your involvement with high school press freedom legislation?
( ) I am currently sponsoring such legislation for the first time.
( ) I am currently reintroducing such legislation that failed to pass in a previous attempt.
( ) I sponsored such legislation in a previous session. It failed, but I plan to try again in the future.
( ) I sponsored such legislation in a previous session. It failed, and I do not plan to try again.
( ) Other (please specify) _____

If you previously sponsored high school press legislation that did not pass, please answer the following questions:

23. What, in your opinion, are some of the reasons why the legislation failed? (check all that apply)
( ) Lack of interest among other legislators
( ) Lack of lobbyist activities among supporters
( ) Lack of support from the professional news media
( ) Opposition from school boards and teacher organizations
( ) Concern about unregulated high school publications
( ) Other (please specify)_____

24. If you are reintroducing legislation that failed previously, what are you doing differently? Briefly explain any changes in the bill or altered strategies to improve the chances of getting it passed.

25. In nearly 20 states no efforts have been launched to pass high school press freedom legislation. Do you have any additional advice we could pass on to legislators and concerned journalism educators in those states about what to do and what not to do?

(please continue on back side of this page)

Would you please answer the following questions concerning yourself. (The information is for comparison purposes only; it will not be used in any way that would publicly identify specific legislators.)

27. Your political affiliation is ( ) Democrat ( ) Republican ( ) Independent

28. Describe your constituency in the terms provided:
( ) rural ( ) urban ( ) rural-urban mix ( ) suburban

29. Your occupation: _____

30. Your education:
( ) high school or less ( ) vocational
( ) bachelor's degree in _____
( ) master's degree in _____
( ) doctorate in _____

31. Years in legislature:
( ) one ( ) 2-4 ( ) 5-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16-20 ( ) 20 or more

32. How long had you been in your elected position when your student press bill was proposed?
( ) 1 year ( ) 2-4 ( ) 5-10 ( ) 11-15 ( ) 16-20 ( ) 20 or more

33. As a student, did you have high school journalism experience?
( ) none ( ) newspaper ( ) yearbook ( ) journalism class(es)
( ) Other (please specify) _____

34. As a student, did you have college journalism experience?
( ) none ( ) newspaper ( ) yearbook ( ) journalism minor ( ) journalism class(es)

35. Do you have professional journalism experience?
( ) none ( ) newspaper ( ) broadcast ( ) PR ( ) advertising
( ) magazine ( ) other (please list) _____

Your name _____ Your state _____
(Your name *will not* be used for publication.)

Comments